VOLUME 89 • NUMBER 1 • FEBRUARY 1984

The American Historical Review

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

VOLUME 89 • NUMBER 1 • FEBRUARY 1984

The American Historical Review

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION
Founded in 1884. Chartered by Congress in 1889

Cover illustration: Herbert Hoover on a fishing trip in Yellowstone National Park with Park Superintendent Horace Albright, August 1927. Albright later became director of the National Park Service. Photograph reproduced courtesy of the Herbert Hoover Presidential Library, West Branch, Iowa. See the article in this issue by Kendrick A. Clements, "Herbert Hoover and Conservation, 1921–33," pages 67–88.

The *American Historical Review* appears in February, April, June, October, and December of each year. It is published by the American Historical Association, 400 A Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003 (202-544-2422) and is printed and mailed by the William Byrd Press, 2901 Byrdhill Road, Richmond, Virginia 23228. The editorial offices are located in 914 Atwater, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405 (812-335-7609).

The *AHR* is sent to members of the American Historical Association and to institutions holding subscriptions. Membership dues: For incomes of $40,000 and above, $60.00 annually; $30,000–$39,999, $55.00; $20,000–$29,999, $47.00; $15,000–$19,999, $40.00; $10,000–$14,999, $30.00; below $10,000, students, and joint memberships $20.00; associate (nonhistorian) $25.00; life $1,000. The proportion of dues allocated to the *AHR* is $17.00. Subscription rates effective for volume 89: Class I, *American Historical Review* only, United States, Canada, and Mexico $43.00, foreign $47.00. Further information on membership, subscriptions, and the ordering of back issues is contained on the two pages—1(a) and 2(a)—immediately preceding the advertisements.

Information concerning the submission of manuscripts and other matters of interest to authors and reviewers is contained on page 2(a), immediately preceding the advertisements.

Notice of nonreceipt of an issue must be sent to the Membership Secretary of the Association within three months of the date of publication of the issue. Changes of address should be sent to the Membership Secretary by the first of the month preceding the month of publication. The Association is not responsible for copies lost because of failure to report a change of address in time for mailing. Postmaster: Please send notification (Form 3579) regarding undelivered journals to: American Historical Association, 400 A Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003. Publication identification number: *American Historical Review* (ISSN 0002-8762). The Association cannot accommodate changes of address that are effective only for the summer months.

Second-class postage paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing offices

VOLUME 89 • NUMBER 1 • FEBRUARY 1984

The American Historical Review

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

Contributors:

JOHN EASTBURN BOSWELL, a professor of history at Yale University, studied at the College of William and Mary (A.B., 1969) and at Harvard University (M.A., 1971; Ph.D., 1975). He specializes in the social history of medieval Europe, particularly the interaction of religious beliefs and social structures—themes he investigated first in *The Royal Treasure: Muslim Communities under the Crown of Aragon in the Fourteenth Century* (1977) and then addressed from another perspective in *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality: Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century* (1980). He is pursuing both of these subjects in new works in preparation and is also completing a study of the abandonment of children in ancient and medieval Europe.

KENDRICK A. CLEMENTS is an associate professor of history at the University of South Carolina. He received his Ph.D. at the University of California, Berkeley, under Armin Rappaport and has taught American history and American diplomatic history at South Carolina since 1967. In 1977–78 he was a Fulbright Professor of American History in Taiwan. He is the author of *William Jennings Bryan, Missionary Isolationist* (1982), the editor of *James F. Byrnes and the Origins of the Cold War* (1982), and the author of articles on diplomatic and environmental history in *Diplomatic History*, the *Pacific Historical Review*, and other journals. His essay here is part of an ongoing study of Herbert Hoover and conservation, for which research was conducted under a Hoover Library Association fellowship in 1981–82. He is also at work on a biography of Woodrow Wilson, to be published as part of the new Twayne American Biography series in 1986.

PHILIP D. CURTIN taught at Swarthmore College and the University of Wisconsin, Madison, prior to joining the faculty in history of Johns Hopkins University in 1975. He did his undergraduate work at Swarthmore and received his graduate degrees from Harvard University. A specialist in the history of Africa and the Caribbean basin in comparative perspective, he is the author of, among other studies, *Two Jamaicas* (1955), *The Image of Africa* (1964), *The Atlantic Slave Trade: A Census* (1969), and *Economic Change in Pre-Colonial Africa* (1975) and the editor of *Africa and the West* (1969).

LAWRENCE W. LEVINE is a professor of history at the University of California, Berkeley. He is the author of *Defender of the Faith: William Jennings Bryan, The Last Decade, 1915–1925* (1965), and *Black Culture and Black Consciousness: Afro-American Folk Thought from Slavery to Freedom* (1977). His current study of American culture during the Great Depression has led him back to the nineteenth century to examine the transformations that created the types of popular culture that became characteristic of the twentieth century. His essay in this issue on Shakespeare and the American people is the first product of that investigation.

Contents

VOLUME 89 • NUMBER 1 • FEBRUARY 1984

Presidential Address

Articles

Reviews of Books

Would it not have been better to have devoted more attention to James's Harvard colleague Josiah Royce? The latter's philosophical idealism, his interest in human values realized in a universe far less open than James's, and his sense of community based on local spirit and local pride are qualities much esteemed among conservatives.

Elsewhere, Clark's analysis is suggestive, even when not persuasive. Aware that traditionalists and libertarians disagree on matters such as abortion, censorship, the draft, and the Monroe Doctrine, he argues that they join in opposing collectivism and in venerating private-property rights. Years ago, Frank Meyer, the leading champion of "fusionism," edged beyond this bare formulation. Clark asserts that "the idea of diversity offers another common denominator" (p. 186) around which various schools of conservatism can coalesce. But the point is immaterial because the meaning of diversity varies in the work of Frank Meyer and Russell Kirk, Eric Voegelin and Murray Rothbard, John Hallowell and Milton Friedman. Kirk excoriated Meyer for deifying an abstract conception of liberty around which no society could long remain cohesive. An overflow of diversity and "licentious freedom" was "metaphysically mad" and incompatible with an ordered community. Diversity promises even fewer returns as an organizing conservative principle when we find it affirmed by liberals so contrasting as Thomas Jefferson and John Dewey.

Nevertheless, *Coherent Variety* demonstrates real differences between British conservatives, who sought diversity among groups, and their more individualistic American counterparts who, living among many religions, sects, races, and unmeltable ethnics, found less enchanting the actual lineaments of diversity.

RONALD LORA
University of Toledo

PETER CALVERT. *The Concept of Class: An Historical Introduction*. New York: St. Martin's Press. 1982. Pp. 254. $22.50.

Peter Calvert's purpose is to study the different concepts of class in the West; his work is what he calls a "taxonomy of definitions" (pp. 202, 209). He begins with the classical concept of class as balance and continues with discussions of the pre-Marxian and Marxian concepts of class struggle and the well-known post-Marxian complex of class, status, and power. He then surveys the concepts of class in advanced capitalism and in socialist states and ends with observations on the difficulty of applying the concept of class to the analysis of contemporary Britain, the United States, and France. Calvert concludes that presently the concept of class is considerably confused, since it does not mean exactly economic standing, status, or power. In fact, class has been an essentially contested concept among users, and so we might as well abandon it altogether, thus overcoming the prejudice of "classism" (p. 216).

According to Calvert, concept means a label, a name we give to an abstract entity. And his taxonomy of the concepts of class actually turns out to be a survey of the changing definitions of class. The very use of the word taxonomy is revealing, for according to Foucault *taxinomia* is the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century classification of things in a static, mechanical space (*The Order of Things*, chap. 5). Therefore, what Calvert is giving us is the natural history of a concept. Concepts do change. But Calvert assumes there ought to be an unchanging, Platonic or scientific, idea. Since his survey proves to him that universality is not attainable, he advocates the abolition of the concept of class.

But class as an essentially contested concept, although an obstacle to academic objectivity, is an integral part of the real world. People are oppressed and killed in the name of class. Because class is contested, it ought to be studied as the ideological iceberg of a structured, dynamic social totality. In other words, we study the changing concept of class in order to obtain an intimation of the changing class conflict in society.

DONALD M. LOWE
San Franciso State University

CARROLL QUIGLEY. *Weapons Systems and Politcal Stability: A History*. Washington: University Press of America or Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Georgetown. 1983. Pp. xvii, 1043. $36.50.

On his death in 1977, Carroll Quigley, professor at Georgetown University, left a long, but incomplete, manuscript, which his colleagues have now put into print (by photocopy of the typescript) together with appreciative comments and a list of his publications. The author's objective is to enlighten Americans on "the history of weapons systems and tactics, with special reference to the influence that these have had on political life and the stability of political arrangements" (p. 35).

Early in the work we are given an analysis of several dichotomies in military development: (1) amateur versus specialized weapons, the former of which could encourage the rise of democracy; (2) missile versus shock weapons, the former of which were preferred by Asiatic peoples 2000 B.C. to A.D. 1400, while Indo-European stocks tended to use shock weapons in that period; (3) the relative advantage of offensive or defensive tactics, a field in which oscillations have repeatedly taken place.

These variations are then discussed in the long sweep of human development from prehistory down to about A.D. 1500. The bulk of the text is devoted to Greek and Roman history for the period after what Quigley calls the "great divide" in Western civilization that occurred about 600 B.C., but there is ample space for Chinese and nomadic history. The book is far more widely based than the brief bibliography suggests and is often provocatively independent in its judgments. Quigley does hop back and forth between Greece and Rome and mixes events of several centuries in one paragraph; the reader needs to be already well at home in ancient and also medieval history.

One would wish to speak well of a work with such earnest intent, on which the author spent the last twelve years of his life, but the study must be faulted on many levels. Straightforward errors may be excused as trivial. More serious on the factual side are Quigley's view that Indo-European peoples everywhere shared a fundamentally common ideology—the search for immortality through public renown—and his overemphasis on naval power; he also has the strange misconception that ancient historians nowadays do not often consider slavery as vital in Greek development.

The major structural flaw, however, is on a higher level, that of the organization of the whole work; for Quigley does not really carry out his intention. His surveys of changes in weapons systems are thoughtful and valuable, but for the reader they become muddled and ineffective amid the detailed narrative and descriptive treatments of political history over many centuries. Nor does the author provide clear judgments about the relations of the two factors in his tale. One looks, for instance, for a sharp analysis of the rise of Rome in light of its significant changes in weapons systems; instead, there is a lengthy discussion of the Roman constitution and other aspects that swell the bulk but do not bear on the topic.

In the end, moreover, is H. J. Hogan correct in his foreword to the book when he asserts that "society's decisions regarding its weapons systems have been decisive in shaping human social, economic, and political decisions," or is the reverse as likely to be correct? Quigley thought that the Greeks could become democratic because they used amateur weapons; but if Athens did have a democratic constitution for two centuries, it was for very different reasons, and almost all Greek states remained conservatively oligarchic in structure. Elsewhere Quigley is more careful not to explain the complexities of history simply by adducing one factor; among many examples, one may cite his treatment of the Middle Ages (p. 813), in which the role of weapons systems is noted but far more weight is assigned to the concept of providential deity (or, in the case of the Latin West, the failure of this ideology to gain command).

Recently Douglass C. North has observed in an interesting study, *Structure and Change in Economic History*, "While there is an immense literature on military technology itself, it has seldom been explored in terms of its implications for political structure" (p. 25). Quigley tried, but lost his way in details. Specialists may find profit in some of his comments; for the average American citizen the task still remains an open one.

CHESTER G. STARR
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

RICHARD OLSON. *Science Deified and Science Defied: The Historical Significance of Science in Western Culture from the Bronze Age to the Beginnings of the Modern Era ca. 3500* B.C. *to ca.* A.D. *1640*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1982. Pp. xv, 329. $32.50.

This is not history of science of the traditional variety. Instead of tracing the march of scientific ideas from primitive notions to the sophisticated mathematical physics of the seventeenth century, Richard Olson focuses on the relationship between science and other aspects of culture. His concern is not principally with scientific content but with scientific attitudes as they reflected and influenced religion, politics, philosophy, and the arts over a period of five thousand years. Olson defines science as "a set of activities and habits of mind aimed at contributing to an organized, universally valid, and testable body of knowledge about phenomena" (p. 7). This definition is broad enough to encompass the achievements of ancient Mesopotamian priests, Plato, Aristotle, certain fathers of the Christian church, medieval Scholastics, and Renaissance engineers and artisans (of the more scholarly sort); such breadth may disconcert your local professor of physics, but it nicely delimits what Olson wants to write about.

Much of Olson's book is devoted to the relationship between science and religion. For example, Olson finds the beginnings of science in the astronomical and astrological efforts of Sumerian priests, who substituted astral deities for the traditional agricultural gods and introduced fatalistic astrology into Sumerian religion; this astrology, he maintains, was borrowed by Zoroastrianism and transmitted eventually to hellenistic religious cults. He argues that pre-Socratic philosophers introduced a vision of the world (and therefore of the gods) that was radically at odds with Homeric religion; this accelerated the demise of the latter, which was already crumbling as a result of the yawning gap between it